UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

ARTICLES BY—

John Malick

Karl A. Bach

Oliver L. Reiser

Archie J. Bahm

Victor S. Yarros

John H. Hershey

Georg J. M. Walen

Raymond B. Bragg

Poems, Book Reviews, Correspondence

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 11

Chicago, January, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
- Editorial—CURTIS W. REESE 175
- Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 176
- Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 179

ARTICLES—
- The Dilemma of Civilization—GEORG J. M. WALEN 180
- Man in the Universe—JOHN H. HERSHEY 181
- The Comstockian Menace—JOHN MALICK 183
- Some Theses of the New Humanism—OLIVER L. REISER 185
- Is Your Religion Big Enough for Your World?—KARL A. BACH 186
- Religion in Wartime—RAYMOND B. BRAGG 187
- Is the Humanist Manifesto Humanistic?—ARCHIE J. BAHM 188
- Is Pacifism Fallacious?—VICTOR S. YARROS 190

POETRY—
- For Ralph Cheyney—D. SANIAL GILL 178
- In Memoriam to Ralph Cheyney—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 179
- The Heavenly World—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 186
- Faith in the Future—JEROME ALEXANDER 187

THE STUDY TABLE—
- For Young People } —JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 191
- A Book of Poems }

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Lest We Forget—OLIVE COLE SMITH 191
- Already Answered by the March of Events—HENRY WINN PINKHAM 192
- Why Not Scientific Realism?—VICTOR S. YARROS 192
- Betrayal—FLORENCE HOGE 192

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Contributors

Georg J. M. Walen: Minister of the Nora Free Christian Church, Hanska, Minn.

John H. Hershey: Minister of the First Congregational Society in West Bridgewater, Mass.

John Malick: Formerly, minister of The First Unitarian Congregational Church of Cincinnati, Ohio, and member of the Board of Education, Cincinnati.

Oliver L. Reiser: Professor of Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh, Penna.

Karl A. Bach: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Des Moines, Iowa.

Raymond B. Bragg: Minister of the First Unitarian Society, Minneapolis, Minn.

Archie J. Bahm: Professor of Philosophy, Texas Technological College, Lubbock.

Victor S. Yarros: Frequent contributor to liberal journals.

Personals

The Reverend Daniel Sands, formerly minister at Quincy, Illinois, and more recently with the Unitarian Service Commission at Great Lakes, has been settled as pastor of the First Unitarian Church, Sioux City, Iowa.

The Reverend Kenneth L. Patton of Vermont, Illinois, began his pastorate of the First Unitarian Society at Madison, Wisconsin, January fourth.

The Reverend Edwin T. Buehrer was installed as minister of the Third Unitarian Church, Chicago, Illinois, Sunday evening, December seventh. The sermon was delivered by Dr. A. Eustace Haydon of the University of Chicago, and the charge to the minister and the congregation was given by Dr. Charles H. Lyttle of Meadville Theological School.

The Reverend Lon Ray Call, minister at large for the American Unitarian Association, preached in the Unitarian Church at Duluth for the six Sundays preceding Christmas, and while there made a survey of the church and the community with a view to the reinvigoration of the church in that city.

The committee of the Lake Geneva Unitarian Summer Assembly, of which Mrs. Charles H. Moran is the chairman, met in Chicago December 1-3 and formulated extensive plans for the next season.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII JANUARY, 1942 No. 11

EDITORIAL

CURTIS W. REESE

With this issue, UNITY adds a group of new subscriptions from the Western Unitarian Conference. A copy goes to each minister and to each of two key persons in every church in the Conference. This issue carries, as will subsequent issues, brief news items of general interest to religious liberals and a number of articles by Unitarian ministers. In a way this is the resumption of a service for which UNITY was originally founded. There was not in the beginning, and there is not now, any organic relationship between the Conference and UNITY. But now, as then, their purposes are alike, and their destinies are intertwined. The motto carried by UNITY since its founding as the *Pamphlet Mission* in 1878—Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion—is the official motto of the Western Unitarian Conference and has been carried on its seal since its incorporation in 1882. The men who founded UNITY as the unofficial organ of western Unitarianism —Robert Collyer, William C. Gannett, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, C. W. Wendte, and J. C. Learned—were ministers of the Conference, and Jenkin Lloyd Jones was Secretary. For many years UNITY's chief source of subscriptions was the area of the Western Unitarian Conference; and the proceedings of the Conference and its auxiliary organizations were published in the columns of UNITY, as were many of the great Unitarian sermons of those days. Since then the scope of UNITY has broadened, as has also that of the churches it was founded to serve. New issues have arisen and new battle lines have been formed, but the essentials to which both are committed remain as they were—Freedom, Fellowship, and Character in Religion.

The importance of effective prosecution of the war on the part of the United States and the nations associated with us cannot be over-emphasized. Nothing short of complete victory should be contemplated. Meanwhile it is also of paramount importance that we practice the maximum democracy that is possible in our land while the war is in progress, and so prepare ourselves to insist on democracy throughout the world when the war is over. All our reserves of sanity and poise must be called into play to the end that we shall not forget ourselves and violate the very principles for which we fight. In our land are people from many lands, who are loyal and patriotic citizens. We must guard their rights, with full confidence that they will fulfill their duties. This applies also to honest and sincere pacifists. The few who may be correctly designated as "fifth columnists" can and should be taken care of by the properly constituted authorities. This is no time to dissipate our energies in suspicion, bitterness, and hatred directed toward innocent persons. Especially must we guard against the over-excitement that distorts judgment and enfeebles the will. To save ourselves at home and to win the war abroad we shall need clear minds, resolute determination, and great patience. Anything that vitiates these values is an ally of our foes; and anything that fosters them is enlisted on our side. Let there be no mistake about this matter. We are in for a long and trying period, and we shall need to keep in the pink of condition, morally as well as physically. The institutions devoted to social, intellectual, and spiritual well-being must keep their flags flying high. They are needed now as never before, and they will be needed increasingly in the desperate days ahead.

By coordinating the policies and resources of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and their allies, there can be created an anti-Axis force that will make victory in war ultimately certain, and which can also win the peace. To do this fully will require not only a genuine willingness to share sacrifices in proportion to ability, but also the abandonment of narrow nationalisms in favor of a larger patriotism. Each ally must develop sympathetic understanding of the other. Problems must be faced and solved cooperatively. The resources of all must be available for each in terms of their needs. Petty jealousies could do more harm than Axis cannons. Let the Allies call a moratorium on the very memory of ancient feuds, and commit themselves

to the effective action that will bring complete victory and a lasting peace.

As these notes are written a dispatch comes from New York to the effect that John Haynes Holmes has tendered an undated resignation to the Community Church, to be effective if and when the church finds his pacifist position injurious to its well-being. It goes without saying that the Community Church, which is of the liberal tradition, will go on record for freedom of conscience in such matters of opinion, and that the resignation will not become effective. Pacifism as such is not contrary to liberal religious practice, nor is it in violation of the laws of the land. What is done with either pacifism or interventionism may become an issue but certainly not the mere holding of the position or the reasonable expression of it. There are a great many liberal ministers who are pacifists; and they will have no difficulties with either church or state if they observe the common courtesies of discussion, exercise toward others the tolerance they expect toward themselves, and give some recognition to the eternal fitness of things. During these exciting times both pacifists and non-pacifists should remember that temperance of utterance is a virtue of the first rank. Nerves are on edge, and people are abnormally sensitive. Let the true liberal, whatever his position on a particular issue, remember that others equally honest hold differing views. When these days are over we shall want to be able to live with each other, and what is still more important we shall want to be able to live with ourselves! While we fight for freedom everywhere in the world, let us prove that we know how to use freedom here at home.

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

It was in 1934 that I wrote a play, which was later produced on Broadway by the New York Theatre Guild. This play, entitled "If This Be Treason," set forth the drama of a war between Japan and the United States. It opened with a scene in the White House, interrupted by sudden news of the opening of hostilities by an attack by Japan, without warning, upon Manila. What took place on Sunday, December 7th, was precisely what took place in my play. But there was nothing in the slightest degree remarkable in this forecast. For this is war! Japan did nothing unique or unprecedented. Germany has turned this same trick more than once during the last few years. Japan herself opened her war against Russia in 1904 with an attack upon Port Arthur and the Russian fleet identical with her attack upon Pearl Harbor and the American fleet. History is full of such episodes—as, for example, the English attack upon Denmark in the great battle of Copenhagen. The surprise attack is as old at least as Gideon, and if we do not like it, it is because we do not like war. And the same thing applies to Germany and Italy in their declarations of war against this country. They are only carrying out to its logical conclusions this horrid business of armed conflict. With a world in flames, we now see what our civilization has come to. This is *"die Gotterdamerung"*—the dusk of the gods of force and violence and armed might. And there remains nothing to us, as to people everywhere, but to see it through and endure as best we can the hours of bleak darkness. That darkness will seem impenetrable, for this is going to be a long and hard war, as the President has wisely told us. But in the darkness there shines a light, which those who live in the spirit may see. This light is God, who is comfort, counsel, wisdom, and love. He has led us through darkness hitherto, and will now lead us again. He will not fail, though all else fail. His light, like a candle in the wind, will shine, until it shows itself a star which heralds the dawning of a glad new day. So I make my own the words of Browning's Paracelsus:

> If I stoop
> Into a dark tremendous sea of cloud,
> It is but for a time; I press God's lamp
> Close to my breast; its splendor, soon or late,
> Will pierce the gloom: I shall emerge one day.

II

Remarkable and praiseworthy has been the conduct of the nation thus far in this overwhelming crisis. No panic, no hysteria, little hatred! The noble speech of the President on the evening of December 9th helped immeasurably to steady the people's nerves. What might have been a horror story keyed to the stirring up of the public mind to wild alarm and bitter cruelty was a calm, sober, and elevated discourse, which set a standard of exemplary behavior for all men everywhere. Action in respect to enemy aliens was of course inevitable, and was carried out with a minimum of inconvenience and excitement. Here and there appeared cruel instances of prejudice against Japanese, but these were few, and were immediately corrected by vigorous protective measures by enlightened citizens. Pacifists have not been interfered with. Churches, even when favoring ardently the country's entrance into the war, have counselled moderation, good will, and justice. The provocation in the Japanese attack to popular dementia could not have been more terrible, yet there was everywhere dignity consistent with resolution.

Even the newspapers, with a few lamentable exceptions, kept their heads. A fortunate circumstance in the crisis was the public celebration of the 150th anniversary of the enactment of the Bill of Rights, which is the great charter of human liberty in America. Elaborate preparations for a fitting commemoration of this event had been made long before the war broke. Dinners, mass meetings, school and church exercises, all had been arranged, with participants running all the way from the President of the United States to humble citizens in small communities. And the program went through precisely as planned! Nothing could have been more remarkable, for the nation was given such a reminder of what the Bill of Rights means in terms of freedom of speech, press, public assembly, worship, and so forth, as it has not enjoyed in generations. We are fighting for liberty—that was one side of it, especially as urged by Mr. Roosevelt in his 15th of December radio address. But there was another side, and that was that, while fighting for it abroad, liberty must be preserved at home. Such a message, iterated and reiterated from coast to coast, lifted the land to the highest temper of mind and heart as it entered on the grim business of war. That this level can be maintained is not to be expected. The psychology of war is perfectly well-known from sad experience. But meanwhile we can rejoice that thus far America has met the best and not the worst standards of public conduct.

III

And now, what shall the pacifists do? The answer is easy. Stand fast by principle, and "carry on!" This does not mean opposition to or interference with war activities. I agree absolutely with the clear statement of the Fellowship of Reconciliation that they will not "oppose, obstruct, or interfere with officials, soldiers, or citizens in the performance of what they regard as their patriotic duty." But it does mean the exercise of the full freedom established in a democracy to voice honest opinion, to be loyal to fixed conviction, and to advance the eternal cause of peace and brotherhood. The English pacifists, faithful as ever after two years and more of dreadful conflict, show us the way in which we should walk. Thus, we read in the November issue of the *Christian Pacifist,* published in London on paper rationed to the publication office by the English government, a reaffirmation of the statement that "the logic of the pacifist position" is the plea for "an immediate cessation of hostilities." Then follows:

> A renunciation of war that does not at the same time renounce the causes of war is futile. But that does not mean that anything can be gained by continuing the use of methods which we believe are both morally wrong and practically ineffective. If the evils of Nazism could be beaten in that way then none of us would ever have been pacifists. It is because we believe that the way of world salvation is that of a suffering and defenceless Christ that we are Christians. Those who are able to believe that the horrors of Nazism can be defeated by the horrors of war must go and fight, and we shall respect their sincerity and admire their self-sacrifice, but we shall not mistake them for pacifists. The pacifist is one who, desiring to see a righteous world order, pleads with his fellow-creatures to stop this crazy, uncertain, disastrous attempt to quell evil, so that we can begin to put into action a wise and assured method of righting the world's wrongs.

Yes, the English pacifists have shown us the way. Their work has been simple and unceasing: (1) to keep up their hearts; (2) to seek out posts of danger in the civilian service where they can match the self-sacrifice of the soldier; (3) to protect and vindicate the rights under the law of conscientious objectors; (4) to labor steadfastly for the sick, the starving, the homeless, the refugees, in all lands; (5) to plead for the earliest possible negotiated peace; and (6) to study and formulate plans for a peace after the war that will endure. There is our program for America and for the world!

IV

So many people seem to be surprised by what is happening in Russia! Why so? Do these people know no history? Russia has never been successfully invaded. Charles XII of Sweden tried it, and failed; Napoleon tried it, and failed. Hitler has now tried it, and why should he succeed? Any study of the present situation would indicate clearly why history is thus repeating itself. The Soviet government, for example, has always been energetic and efficient. It has enormous industrial achievements to its credit. When one considers what we know about Russia's success in building dams, water power sites, automobile factories, railroads, and so forth, why should we be surprised at her equal success in building armies, tanks, and airplanes? What she has done on the industrial front, she has done also on the military front, that's all. Then these Red soldiers—are they any different from what Russian soldiers have always been when fighting to defend their country? The Russian peasant has a superstitious devotion to the soil. When an enemy appears on that soil, to take it away from him, he fights with the madness of a Moslem mullah. It is not for Stalin or Communism that these millions of Russian men and women have been fighting until they died in these recent months, but for the land, the crops, the homes, the villages of Holy Russia. Then, on the other side, is the inevitable break in the morale of German troops. We read that when Napoleon retreated from Moscow, he led soldiers who were not only starved in body but sick in soul. They were homesick, and therefore helpless. There is something about the endless steppes of Russia, especially in icy winter, that overbears and casts down the heart of the man who knows the sweet, fair lands of western Europe. Knowing Germany and Russia as I do, I can well imagine that those hosts of Nazi boys have simply turned to gloominess and despair, and are now retreating because they cannot and will not fight. There are psychological limits, after all, to even the most iron military discipline, and Hitler is finding these in Russia.

His task now is to hold his armies together, and thus to avoid the utter rout suffered by his famous predecessors. We are inclined to feel that he will succeed and that Russia will be recorded as a battle rather than as a war lost. But it is Hitler's first defeat, and may well mark a turning point in this man's fatal and fatalistic career.

V

It is announced in the New York *Times* that the Rupert Brooke of this war has been found. Whether this is true or not, I do not know. Since he has had to be discovered, it is evident that he has not revealed himself as did Brooke in the last war, when he flashed across the dark firmament of conflict like a blazing meteor. Which may well remind us that poetry is playing no such part in this war as it did in the last war! Think of the poets in 1914-18—Kipling, Hardy, Masefield, Noyes, Gibson, Stephen Phillips, all of whom wrote noble verse, and newer men, first known in the war, such as Brooke himself, Sassoon, Owen, Sorley, Macrae, and many others. The last war was pitched from the beginning on a high note of idealism which awoke the soul of England, a country which has nobler poetry to its credit than any other nation since ancient Greece. But after the war came disillusionment. The poets in England became bitter, like Eliot in *The Waste Land,* or else they lapsed into silence. And nothing in this war seems to have touched the heart again. There is plenty of talk of democracy, and saving the world from the barbarians, and "there will always be an England"—but nothing stirs. Perhaps the fighting is too horrible, and the prospects of the future too dark, to allow of song. Or perhaps the stubborn soul of man knows the truth about war, including this war, and takes up arms not because he wants to as in some high crusade, but because he has to in some grim necessity imposed upon him by the hand of fate. No, there is no *elán* in this struggle, no glory, no great end and aim. It is just "a mess," into which we all have tumbled because we all had a tragic hand in its making. It is this sense of common guilt, quite as often unconscious as conscious, which has overwhelmed us all, and made this war the saddest as well as the most terrible that man has ever known. The poets are gone everywhere—in Germany because they are dead, in England because they are dumb. How, in such a war, the heart of any man can be moved to hatred, or even fear, is more than I can understand. I can feel no passion save that of a profound compassion for all men everywhere—a pity, almost too great to bear, for stricken multitudes. If there is any poetry, it must be that of the Psalmist who wept when he remembered Zion.

VI

There are certain things in life which are fascinating in the sense that they are so baffling. For example, such a fact as that "most criminals belong to some church. The big majority attend church services every Sunday morning in the Maryland Pen. . . . 14.3 per cent are frankly agnostic. The criminal is religious." (Professor Carl Murchison, in *Criminal Intelligence.*) In this statement is an explanation of the extraordinary episodes that follow the murder of a gangster, or the death of a "big-shot" politician. A church funeral, elaborate ecclesiastical rites, expensive burial! "The criminal is religious." But why? How explain such an extraordinary phenomenon? Another and somewhat analogous fact has to do with juvenile delinquency. Of 1636 delinquents studied in Chicago, says Dr. William Healy, in the *Individual Delinquent,* "90 per cent were of religious background. Participation in religious education had been quite general among our offenders. . . . It is quite evident that formal religious training has not prevented delinquency in many cases." Yet a strong and successful movement is under way today to secure "released time" for children in our public schools, so that these children may be educated under religious as well as secular direction. But what guaranty is there that this religious education under "released time" will do anything more than rob the children of one period a week at their desks and books? There seems to be a peculiar anomaly here—religion closely identified with the very denial of all that comprises virtue. To a person totally unacquainted with the topsy-turvy realities of human life, it might not illogically appear as though religion existed for the express purpose of fostering crime, producing delinquency, creating ill. If things always go along together, there is some connection between them, isn't there? No, this is a quite unwarranted conclusion. Things are not quite so bad, or so ridiculous, as all that. But that there's something dead wrong somewhere is evident. Religion, like education, is not succeeding at its job. Not only as regards criminals and delinquents, but also as regards great masses of men and women who, for all their religious training as children and their religious associations as adults, still give themselves over utterly to materialistic living which seeks no higher aim than that of possession and pleasure! Religion fails to break the surface of worldliness in the human heart. It is not inconsistent with all that has conspired to wreck our world. What are we to do? Where lies the remedy?

For Ralph Cheyney

Add to the roster of the Living Dead
The name of this Priceless One who could not compromise with wrong;
Whose weapons in his battle for the Disinherited
Were but the Lightning and the Thunder of his Song.
His Deathless Song!

D. Sanial Gill.

Jottings

Overheard from the adjacent chair in a barbershop:

> My wife is a Baptist, and I am a Unitarian, so we go to the Congregationalist church. My daughter in a southern college wrote that the church there was Methodist, and could she go. And I said, "Why not?"

Here is a happy family, and an open-minded and open-hearted spirit of religion!

Here is what a friend writes me from Sweden:

> Russia has been the arch-enemy of Europe for years and years. Russia would love to swallow Finland, Sweden, Norway—that we all know and have known for scores of years. Russia has been the great menace over here. Now we have Great Britain and U. S. A. helping Russia. A most ironical development!

There remain probably but a few precious weeks to get refugees out of Europe. The curtain of darkness is settling over that continent, and it is likely to become impenetrable and impassable. Let every available dollar be given and used *now* to effect such rescues as may still be possible.

The release of Jawaharlal Nehru and his associates from prison in India may be taken as a tardy act of justice, or as a bribe to Indian disaffection, or as a gesture of decent respect for the conscience of mankind. In any case, it is welcome!

The celebration of the 150th anniversary of the American Bill of Rights came within the week of this country's entrance into the most dreadful war in all its history. In the famous Millikan Case after the Civil War, the Supreme Court said:

> The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, *equally in war and in peace,* and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances.

I record herewith my admiration for Miss Jeannette Rankin as the bravest woman alive. Even those who most utterly disagree with her must recognize her sublime courage in standing up *alone* to cast her vote against war in accordance with the life-long convictions of her soul. And of all the anti-war men in Washington, there was not one to take his place beside her!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

In Memoriam to Ralph Cheyney

They say that he is dead,
What can that mean?
That his ingenious fingers
Pluck no more
The strings of song?
That from his lips no more are heard
Those sun-dipped words
To which his flaming breath
Gave flesh and blood,
Words that his incandescent soul
Wove into multi-voiced rhapsodies
And welded into lightning-steeled Excalibur?

They say that he is dead,
What can that mean?
Do lips that speak no more
And hands that write no more,
A brain that thinks no more,
A heart that beats and throbs no more
To Life's Prelude and Fugue
Of joy and pain, despair and hope,
Do these spell death?

Is Homer dead,
Because he strums no more
His lyre to the majestic sweep
Of epic dactyls?
Is Sappho dead,
Because her Lesbian lute
Is mute?
Is Byron dead,
Since Missolonghi's rebellious plains
Surrendered his rapt spirit
To a realm of other melody?

Is Tara's harp forever silenced
Because its vibrant tones of yesterday
Are only echoes now and sighing memories?

We shall not believe that he is dead
Nor anymore a shadow-form than these
Who through the ages woke to truth
Each valiant word
And made of Poetry
The Shining Presence.

He is not dead,
For though his harp be laid aside,
The cadence incomplete,
The symphony unfinished,
And though the poet speaks no more
As mortals speak
And as the ears of mortals
Interpret pulse and beat
Of Titan-speech,
He speaks forever,
Lives forever,
Sings forever his immortal lay
As only those can sing
Whom the Olympian fire
Moves through the star-dust of their earth-bound days
To stand, in stature like a God,
In wisdom like a sage,
In fire and passion of prophetic mould,
Proclaiming—'gainst the rocks and storms and quakes—
The Beauty and the Victory and Pain
Of men becoming MAN again!

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

The Dilemma of Civilization

GEORG J. M. WALEN

To those who try to see the inner relationship of world events before and during the present war, the question of whether or not civilization can defend itself against the forces that will destroy it becomes the paramount issue. Not only from the standpoint of historical antecedent, but equally from the standpoint of close observance of present trends, does it appear that a high state of civilization faces insurmountable difficulties when challenged by an external foe that aims to destroy it. More specifically we may ask the following question: Is there embedded at the very heart and nerve of higher civilization forces that lead to its total disintegration when severely challenged? Concerning this question I shall touch on such phases which to me appear to be fundamental.

At the outset we must recognize the fact that when a high state of civilization is threatened by an external foe that aims to destroy it, it can defend itself successfully only by the same or similar means as those used by the attacker. This, I suppose, is an axiom from the standpoint of man's past experience. On the other hand, we recognize that the means by which it can defend itself successfully are not the means that are commensurate with its true nature. On the contrary, they appear to be means that negate civilization itself. In other words, they are means of brutal force. This is the dilemma of civilization,—it is the dilemma of liberalism in particular, both political and religious liberalism.

Were we for a moment to suppose that a relatively high state of civilization actually succeeded in defeating the foe that aims to destroy it, it follows that in so doing it excelled in brutal force. Only thus can it survive. Precisely at this point, however, it may be asked if it actually is a high state of civilization when it excels in brutality. Let nobody say that this is an academic question. It is our very existence that is at stake, and I should like to believe that even John Haynes Holmes would agree that existence is prior to anything else—free speech, for example. The difficult question as to what constitutes the criteria of a high state of civilization is, of course, at the heart of the dilemma. Rather than to attempt to answer that question here, a better procedure may be to develop the content of the dilemma, and thus by inference suggest an answer to the question.

We are naturally most concerned about the many who approach the dilemma from the standpoint of moral idealism or the ethics of the Gospel tradition. Among those there are a few, very few, as for example Jehovah's Witnesses, who approach the Gospel tradition from the standpoint of an apocalyptic world view. To them, the statement attributed to Jesus: "Ye shall not resist the evil-doer," contains an unconditional command. They can see nothing but evil in this world, and ceaselessly anticipate the next world. The dilemma of civilization, does not, therefore, exist in a real sense for these people. This position has not only the merit of a peculiar kind of consistency; what is, perhaps, more significant, it rests on profound religious insight. We need these people in this sinful world of ours.

It is obvious, however, that the great many who approach the dilemma of civilization from the standpoint of moral idealism are not imbued with the spirit of ascetic perfectionism. They are, indeed, in this world and their moral idealism is usually sociologically conditioned, even when applied to the Gospel tradition. Its basis is evolutionary optimism. However, no conception of evolutionary optimism can change the fact of the sinfulness of man. The potency of ideals in this sinful world of ours embodies, therefore, its own peculiar contradiction. There is, of course, no real solution, except, perhaps, from the standpoint of an unadulterated apocalyptic faith. Viewed from the past experience of man, however, it appears that those who identify the ethical demands of the Sermon on the Mount with a goal that can be superimposed on the normative processes of political and historical reality are taking a position that would lead, should it be generally accepted among men in the western world, to certain collapse of our civilization as we now know it. The implication of such a position, once it is clearly seen, cannot but lead to the most hopeless pessimism about man's destiny. Such appears to be the confusion of the age in which we live, however, that even the editors of the *Christian Century* are not fully aware of the implications of their position. Spengler might say that such a position is the result of ceaseless reflection on abstract principles,—a manifestation of a decadent culture. He may be right, and, again, he may be wrong. But if he is right, we can do nothing but face the future with complete resignation.

The consequences of the position here stated are, therefore, at the very heart of the dilemma. These are plain and easy for all to see. For it is obvious that when a state of civilization, because of inner contradictions, is not in a position to defeat the foe that aims to destroy it, it becomes absolutely certain that it has lost its character. This does not mean that the habits of men suddenly undergo a drastic change, but it does mean that the results, especially those in the realm of spirit, of centuries of struggle towards civilized values, are gradually but definitely obliterated. Thus the position lends credence to the belief in the cyclical and impersonal forces of history, which in substance is the belief in the futility of ideals among men. This is the most hopeless sort of pessimism, and those who hold to the position are usually not aware of its implications. Just the same, if man's past experience means anything whatsoever, it is clear that a situation will then come to exist the cause of which is the confused ideals of men, which result in the collapse of our civilization as we know it. Thus the very basis for moral and social optimism is destroyed, and we are helpless onlookers at the catenation of evil forces which march on relentlessly, indifferent to the hopes of man.

It can therefore hardly be over-emphasized that the great tragedy of our age finds its expression in the confused ideals of men in the western world. To be sure, most of the people who approach the dilemma of civilization from the standpoint of moral idealism are not fully aware of the implications of their position, but this in no way alters the inexorable facts of the situation. It only deepens the crisis of modern civilization. Could they but see that, were their position generally accepted among men in the western world, the result would be the disintegration of civilized values, they might then at least hesitate in speaking so loudly about it. As it is, we witness the sorry spectacle of leaders of the Christian religion confusing their moral idealism

with political and historical reality, in such a manner that they unwittingly lend their support to the forces of tyranny, and thus help to destroy the very basis on which social and moral optimism rests. We can only hope that future historians may say that western civilization was given a chance to save itself by the accident of the help of materialistic communism. If this is a confusion of terms and thoughts, it at least invites a reorientation of our conception of communism. It may not be so far from the Protestant principle after all.

Breasted, in his account of the decline of the Greek civilization, states certain facts and makes some observations which are, to say the least, pertinent to the present trends. His account clarifies the dilemma of a high state of civilization when it is challenged by an external foe. He says that the chieftain of the northern tribes understood perfectly the situation of the disunited Greek world. Thus he proceeded to create an indispensable military power, and improved the art of warfare so that the whole combined force moved and operated as one great unit, an irresistible machine in which every part worked together with all other parts. Breasted makes the observation that "this new chapter in the art of warfare was possible only because a single mind was in unhampered control of the situation." Continuing, he says that the chieftain first began his conquest in the region where he might expect the least resistance, in order later to extend his territory. Thus the principle *one by one* is not new. But the inner contradiction which causes the situation is neither explained nor removed by merely stating the dilemma.

We know the outcome of the Greek struggle. Instead of standing united against a common foe, they divided into two parties. The appeasers followed the leadership of Isocrates, the so-called interventionists had as their outstanding spokesman the great orator Demosthenes. The qualities of these leaders are of minor significance. The underlying tragedy was that there actually existed two opposing parties when they both were confronted with a common foe. At this point many liberals are not willing to draw the inevitable conclusion. This is understandable; but that they are not willing to face the consequences is indeed much more difficult to understand. I do not like to believe so, but the inner logic of the situation compels me to state the view that the consequences can result in nothing but disintegration of civilized values. We cannot act because we tolerate, and we tolerate because we will not admit the beast that is in man. Meanwhile the beast destroys us. If then there is an impenetrable irrationality in world history, we do justice at least to ourselves if we candidly admit it.

But the situation is not as hopeless as that. There is a norm of civilized values. There are times when these values can reassert themselves only after a temporary lapse. The Gordian knot must be cut before the chieftains will do it for us. The men who insist on confusing their particular moral idealism with the normative processes of historical and political reality must be told frankly and very firmly: We will not listen to you. You are unwittingly helping to destroy the very basis on which civilized life rests. You are, whether you know it or not, encouraging the forces of tyranny. You are spreading disaster and inevitable destruction. You are shutting your ears to the cry of miserable victims that are now underneath the tyrant's heel. You have an uneasy conscience from which eminates a confused and faulty interpretation of the Gospel tradition. Your position leads to hopeless pessimism, even though you do not see it yourself. When you speak lightly about the war policies of the White House, and so forth, it is an abomination that cries to heaven. We will not listen to you.

I hear voices saying: But this is not the liberal position. I answer: Existence is prior to anything else. If I want to exist I have to accept a temporary lapse, and pray that it will only be temporary.

Man in the Universe

JOHN H. HERSHEY

It is not enough to be exclusively preoccupied with immediate events as they happen day by day. It is also necessary that a philosophy be worked out that is reasonable in the light of the natural and social sciences, and that somehow relates man to the universe. What may be called the organic conception of man and the universe offers to modern man a reasonable philosophy to live by. This article is an attempt to formulate the main outlines of such a world view.

Let us first, however, consider the meaning of the word "organism." An organism, such as an animal or a human being, has certain characteristics by virtue of which it is a living thing. It is born and it grows and dies. It has an environment to which it strives to adapt itself. Furthermore, it is more than the sum of its parts; it is a vital unity. The parts of a living creature are dependent on the whole for their existence. Conversely, the whole organism functions through its specialized cells and organs. Thus the body sees by means of the eye; without that organ it obviously could not. The whole is dependent on the part for its functioning in certain ways.

Having considered these characteristics of organisms, let us ask the question: Can the universe be said to be like an organism? Is there a close analogy? Although it probably cannot be proved, it seems reasonable to hold that the universe, unlike an organism, was not born or created out of nothing, but is self-existing. Also, if by the universe we mean all things and events, we can hardly suppose that it has an environment, as a living thing has. In these respects, then, the cosmos is not like an organism.

But despite these differences, the cosmos can be usefully thought of as an organism in the following ways. First, it is not merely a collection of things but, like a living being, it is a unity in which the parts are related to one another and to the whole. In this sense, the universe can be called an infinite organism, a macrocosm. Secondly, the parts of the cosmos are dependent on it for their existence. The earth, chemical elements, plant and animal forms, and human beings are literally dependent on the infinite world. Thirdly, like an organism, the universe functions through its parts. The parts are microcosms within the macrocosm.

The generalized statement can thus be made that the universe is a macrocosm or infinite organism in the ways shown. The parts or microcosms have a twofold aspect. They are dependent on the macrocosm for their existence. They are also specialized units by means of which the macrocosm functions.

In the organic conception of man and the universe, human beings are considered as microcosms in relation to the universe. As the cells of the human body are dependent on it for their existence, so are we dependent on the cosmic organism for our existence. Our bodies and minds have sprung from early man and lower animals, reaching back to the origins of life on earth. Thus even our most abstract thoughts are related to the dim and distant beginnings of planetary life. Spatially, too, we are intimately related to the cosmos. Consider the activities occurring when we observe a distant mountain peak. Thought, brain, light waves, distant sun are all factors in our act of observation. Also when we are engaged in the simple act of eating bread, many elements in space and time are involved, such as the sun, the earth, the wheat, the human processes of making flour and the final product. Many and varied, therefore, are our relationships with the universe. Our first conclusion is that in our relation to the whole of being, we are creatures, literally dependent on the cosmos for our existence.

The second matter for consideration is the relation of the infinite organism to ourselves as individuals. Using again the analogy of organisms, we know the body is able to see by the eye, and it only. The whole being functions in its observing capacity through the use of that specialized part. Likewise, the body functions in various other ways by means of definite cells and organs. This resembles the relation of the cosmos to man. The universe, for example, can produce bread only through the activity of its parts, such as the sun, the soil, the wheat, the human being. As we have already seen, we are dependent on cosmic activities beyond ourselves for the bread we eat. But there is also the converse truth, that the universe is dependent on us for our creative part in producing bread. To take a different illustration, if improvements are to be made in the social order, they must be made by man. In our labors to reform evil conditions, we are active agents of the infinite organism. When we develop ourselves to become a baker or reformer we are creators who can act, if we have the great vision, as conscious participants in universal processes. We are part of the universe; through us it acts. We do not, if we possess this vision, develop our capacities for purely selfish purposes, but in order to function as a valuable part of a greater whole. Thus cosmic meaning is given to our finite, planetary life, because only through us as developed persons can the macrocosm create a humane social order here and now. We, as microcosms, become creative beings in the vast organism of the infinite.

In a well-rounded view, both relationships that have been considered must be kept in mind. Our lives have cosmic significance in at least two ways. First, we are dependent on the macrocosm for our being. We are creatures. Secondly, in our particular space-time realm of earth, the macrocosm functions through us. We are or can be creators.

There are various points of view, however, which are more or less opposed to the foregoing conception of man and the cosmos. In the organic world view we do not seek, as some forms of Oriental philosophies teach, to lose our individuality in universal being, as a drop of water loses its identity in the ocean. The organic conception, on the contrary, aims to develop individuals to the full as valuable persons in the whole of being.

Another different view is the conventional religious teaching of God as a personal deity who performs miracles. There is no room for such a theology in the organic philosophy. It must be acknowledged, however, that religious orthodoxy at least attempts, even if mistakenly, to relate man to a larger reality. But the scientific ideas of the universe disclosed by astronomy, geology, and other sciences make the orthodox religious assumptions rather difficult to accept. The infinite organism, however, can be called "God" if such is desired, because there is continuity in meaning between this idea and the kind of pantheism taught by such thinkers as Spinoza. What is important is to recognize the organic nature of the universe, rather than to adopt any particular term to describe it.

Religious humanists and many non-religious liberals and radicals do not seem to emphasize our relationship with the cosmos as both creatures and creators. Social solidarity and betterment are stressed by these men. But they do not sufficiently stress, if at all, the idea of man's relation to the macrocosm which includes individuals and society, but infinitely more. For in the organic conception, as we have seen, it is necessary indeed that individuals develop their capacities in society. But there is added the conviction that individuals develop in order to be conscious and joyous participants in the universal process.

The spirit of capitalism is opposed to the organic conception of man and the cosmos. Capitalism encourages individual action for oneself. Extreme independence is emphasized, instead of man's unity with the social order and the rest of the cosmos. One-sided individual development for money-making is too exclusively its aim. Therefore, much in the capitalistic system can be condemned not only because it has many economic evils, such as periodic depressions, but also because it is spiritually bankrupt from the organic point of view of developing full personalities living a shared life with others. In our conception, labor unions and consumers' coöperatives, and similar institutions should be extended far more than they are as relatively free functioning units for the betterment not only of their own members but also of the whole of society. This differs considerably from the idea that the individual business man should be as independent as possible so as to be able to exploit labor and consumers. The economic system must be changed if it is to be organic with the rest of society.

The philosophy of man as the microcosm and the universe as the macrocosm avoids the extremes presented in the foregoing ideas of certain Oriental philosophies, theologies of a personal deity, humanism, and capitalism. In the organic philosophy, the human being is not completely lost in the absolute, so as to lose identity. On the other hand, the individual is not developed in order to function as independently as possible for exclusively selfish ends. The organic view is that the individual sees himself as a creature nourished by society and the rest of the cosmos, and also sees himself as a creator developing himself to the fullest in order to live as a worthy part of mankind and the cosmos.

The Comstockian Menace

JOHN MALICK

There are a number of safe and unsafe lists, even nature has her own. Magic had her unsafe list; theology took much of it over and added new refinements. Now the bacteriologists have their unsafe list that could not have been before the microscope, and the physicists theirs, rays beneficial and not. We receive papers from abroad with parts blackened out, or letters bearing evidence of having been through official hands. News at times and places is carefully inspected before it circulates at home or crosses the border. In popular use, the word censorship designates what somebody does now and then about magazine, book, or play, all of which concerns but a small part of the population. The word gained wide familiarity with the rise of the motion picture. Censors are those who put the stamp of the state on the film, giving notice to its citizens what may be seen without moral hazard. This is the general use of the word, a safe list by those who know such things, pictures of, and writing about, one particular subject, sex.

Used in this sense, censorship is of recent origin. The first people on the earth had modesty about some things but it was likely as not to be about eating, withdrawing to take food, not being ashamed of the part of life we withdraw to privacy. They did not have morality in terms of the body covered or uncovered, went naked; nor our difficulty about "legitimate" and "illegitimate," did not know the connection between sex and birth. They had no writing. In our sense, there was no work for the censor to do.

The first writing did not make much trouble, each was a handmade copy, only a few could afford it. They talked very frankly about much listed now as vulgar and immoral, as we know from Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, and English classics. Reading was in the hands of those in authority who were their own judges of its effect. They did not worry about what it did to the general population, the impressionable, or children, for they did not read.

What is unsafe writing, what subject matter makes it unsafe? Here we have stages and changing style. The first unsafe writing was about religion, those who did not write properly about it. This would be so, religion being the first matter of general interest to our race and the first subject upon which they presumed to know beyond peradventure of doubt. Unsafe writing about religion was thought to have more dreadful import because of its long range effect, beyond earth and time. Religion had to be right, and exactly right, to produce results, and it had to be believed in and respected which could not be with everyone writing as he pleased. Speaking did not do so much harm, was impermanent, and only churchmen were speaking who said the safe things. But if wrong things got *written*, there they were, going here and there, you never could tell where, or who read them or with what result. So, naturally, religion made the first unsafe list of writing, and religion is what all the first writing was about, what all reading was about. This official unsafe list served a treble purpose, warning to the faithful, bad to read; notice to the trade, what to print; to the critical reader, what to buy. The other kind of unsafe writing was about king and state, treasonable writing. Then, writing of these two kinds got free, neither authority, ecclesiastical nor civil, could keep its ancient privilege of passing upon all writing about itself. Censorship might well have gone out when writing about religion or government ceased to be a crime. If censors had not found new leverage, they would have been forced out. A new situation was at hand, the people were rising to power, church and state went from one to a million heads. Whatever censorship was in the hands of ecclesiast or king, it was still in the laps of the gods what it would be in the hands of the people. Their rise killed the two old lines, you could write what you pleased about church or state, but there was a new kind of writing they thought you had to watch.

This other kind of writing, which you had to keep an eye on—its effects said to be shocking and awful—was not criminal at common law, not noticed by the law. They needed some way to bring it into court. A new crime came into being, "obscene libel," which took the place in the courts that blasphemous and treasonable libel had had before. Here was new business for informers, busybodies, judges, prosecutors, juries, and lawyers, taking the place of the business lost when writing against church and state ceased to be crime. It would not be likely that those concerned with the old crimes would cease to function all at once. They did not cease, functioned on, but they had to bring writing into court now on the charge of obscenity, and they had a new ally to help them—the whole middle class, just come to power, that looked upon free writing about sex as those before had looked upon free writing about church and state, afraid in just the same way that it would undermine the very foundation of society, always the cry of the censor.

It is a long story how writing of this kind, that shocks people, came to the status of crime. Very old, very vague is the charge of being a corrupter of youth. Emotionally it lines up all parents against those named in the charge. One has to be well-grounded not to be swept off his feet by the very sound of the words. The prosecution won the case against Socrates on this indictment. It fells your man, gets him down, which is a good start for finishing him. It is the safest charge because the most vague, like spread poison, vaporized, sprayed over the victim. He never can run down every particle of the spray. Judges at first asked, and quite properly, if the writer meant to corrupt youth by his writings, or was he only a reformer telling about such things to get people stirred not to imitate but to improve a situation, or an artist intent on creation, using his material not just to display it but quite incidentally, not thinking of it as moralists do.

Then the test narrowed into, "whether the tendency of the writing, charged as obscenity, is to deprave and corrupt those whose minds are open to such immoral influences." Here legally was established the Censor's Paradise and Literature's Reign of Terror. With so many kinds of minds, from child to old man, from imbecile to wise man, someone always might be found who would be corrupted. Here is a test of a writing, "Is it obscene?" The Federal Postal Law was written with this test, using these words, "lewd, lascivious, indecent, and obscene." Here are four words, each defined by using the others, and a dozen other words equally indefinite. Have we here four words naming four crimes, or one crime with four names? Must the court find the writing bad on four counts or one?

Somebody had to be charged with the responsibility of judging writing of this kind. Those who grant the copyright might catch it first and not give such writing property right protection. The Copyright Office never did much about it. Then, there were tariff laws, with custom officers to catch it, if shipped in from outside the country, or the postal authorities, if it came by mail. It was difficult to make a thing as indefinite as writing a crime. It has to be done by indirection, had to be done to protect the purity of the mails. Presumably, some responsible person might have been placed in authority to decide what the words might mean to, or do to, people who read such things, always only a very small part of the population. Presumably, you might put in this responsible position those competent in the field of ethics, those who might know morals, or people who write. No such provision was made, so custom house officer, postmaster, and police became the judges of what is impure enough to contaminate the mails or the citizenry. Reaching court, the nature of the writing becomes incidental. What happens to the book becomes of secondary importance, as what happens to the man, free or to the chair, becomes incidental to the success stories being made by prosecutor and defense. Neither may care in the least about the writing which might be inconsequential or the event of the century. The prosecution, paid to defend the fair name of the state, uses his challenges to get an illiterate jury, one that does not read at all or that does not read books. A jury of your peers may mean, in the trial of a writer, twelve illiterates. By the very nature of the contest the defense uses his challenges to fill the box with the literate and the liberal.

In a democracy, censorship laws get on the books through the dogged perseverance of moralists; are slipped through city council, state legislature, or Congress at times of hysteria. Once on the books, there is no way to get them off. Anything as exclusively connected with sex, as censorship is, cannot be dealt with by those depending on the vote. The rule of practical politics is to be silent on such issues where judgment waits upon the emotions, noncommittal until forced, then play down to the most strict, conservative, or worse. If the politician takes the liberal position, the orthodox in morals and religion will be outraged emotionally and hostile at the polls. If the politician plays to the strict and orthodox, he keeps their votes and does not lose the liberals. It is assumed that tolerant liberals are not outraged in their convictions as much by having the will of the orthodox forced upon them as the orthodox would be outraged by being forced to live under the rule of the liberals. This assumption makes the working rule in such highly and hotly controversial issues as censorship. The divided state of liberals, representing no solidarity comparable to the other side, makes it safe political technique. The practical politician will not feel the edge of the liberal group if he puts censorship laws on the books, or refuses to take them off, as he will feel the edge of the stricter sort if he votes to take such censorship off the books.

Censorship has for its purpose to keep certain representations on page or in picture from striking the eye, or, if spoken, from striking the ear. One may say that certain parts of the body striking the eye are all and always bad, or that certain physical functions, or writing about them, or pictures of them, are always bad when measured by what goes on inside, back of the eye and ear, and ought to be forbidden. Unless knowledge is to be stopped in its tracks, certain exceptions have to be admitted. The pictures in the medical books might be just like those on the French postcards. You have just the same subject matter and the same word pictures in the scientific books, in the social workers' reports, that you have in the novel or play. Paul, establishing a new church, writes about the same immodest things as Ben Hecht writing a new play. The law has to be written so as to exclude what is to be excluded without forbidding what would be fatal to scientific or cultural advance to exclude. Then, here is a great body of writing by those before us when the popular taste was different, what about it? If you put contemporary writings under the censor, how save the classics or Bible from the rule? Then, you have the difficulty of getting at the purpose and differentiating all writing that has just the same subject matter. Suppose you have a clean-minded, well-intentioned scientist who wanted to try a new medium. People generally do not read scientific books. Suppose he said that he would popularize his findings by putting out his writing in the form of fiction or drama. What is to be done about him? Is the medical book, or scientific, to be privileged, and his not, although both use the same words about the same subjects?

Specifically, what is the law trying to reach in such cases? In the terminology of our time, it is charged that letters on the page strike the eye and act as sex stimuli. This is the new way of saying it that has not gathered the moral connotations connected with theology's "lust." When we bring sex stimuli into court, we have a distinguished prisoner with powerful and influential connections, somebody in the dock that dwarfs the most distinguished counsel or judge. The indictment is that the writing or picture is sex stimuli. Then sex stimuli have to be appraised. You call the witnesses. Here is a basic life urge that for the purpose of carrying on life has to be stimulated periodically at least. Much of this stimulation is generated within the body itself, does not depend on anything external. Life could not, did not, leave such an important matter to contingency outside the body, but assured the necessary stimulation to carry on her business whether circumstances without did it or not. Most sex stimuli, outside the body, are the effect of the sight of the female on the male and the male on the female. The theologians recognized this and logically removed each from sight of the other. The rule of perfection was to separate them completely in institutions, to resist and nullify all effects of one on the other where the separation could not be complete. Part of early religion was to increase this stimulation for the purpose of mating, as later religion eliminated it for the purpose of celibate perfection. That is, you have to bring much of life into court if sex stimuli are what is indicted. When you bring in only books and pictures, you are hardly touching the difficulty. So few read or ever see pictures that all sex stimuli, from all such causes, are only a speck in the total required by life itself to carry on, and in the total of sex stimuli developed by civilization that is unknown in nature below man. If you want to get at sex stimuli because they are bad, then you have to examine all that does stimulate, of which all that censorship challenges is only a small part of the whole. You have to bring in the human body itself, the whole business of "male and female, created he them," as well as French postcards, the classics, the law books, a lot of drinks, drugs, and foods that easily can be convicted of doing just what the writing or picture is charged with doing. Music is the worst offender, much of it being such stimuli, and designed for the purpose. Here are two ratings of a life process, the scientific-psychological and the theo-

logical. One says that this part is as good as, of one piece with, no worse, no better than, the whole life process. The theological rating of precisely the same facts is that this part of the life process is a sin to the church and a crime to the state, except as tolerated and given legal sanction within strictest limits for begetting offspring. Censorship laws are based upon the theological rating of the pre-scientific age.

Presumably, there is a way to determine the effect on people of such reading, as there is a way to measure the effect of lead poisoning. Always there are enough exposed, those who set the type, read the proof, the book reviewers, buyers of the first copies, the clerks who sell them, the vice society's staff, the custom house officers, the postmasters, the judge, and the lawyers. It is taken to the jury room and read to see what it does to them. There are a lot of people exposed to it. The largest collection of such writing likely is in the offices of the vice societies and there is no evidence that secretaries and typists, who deal with this sort of thing exclusively and always are exposed to it, are affected differently than the staffs of the Bible societies by the writing to which they are constantly exposed. With all these it is accepted that "it doesn't hurt me." Whatever the curiosity, from the vice society agent to the most illiterate juryman, it is the same, "It doesn't hurt me, but others would be hurt." Parents say it would hurt the children who likely already know of it from worse sources than the writing in question. Now children say they are familiar with such things but their parents and grandparents would be disturbed.

The difficulty is that here is something that ought to be known, the matter involved often in the writing, the pictures, the merchandise with which censors deal. Here is involved the whole basis of all life and of the new life and civilization as far as we are to have them. Censorship closes the above-ground channels of distribution; drives underground and makes shameful what ought to be creditable and praiseworthy to communicate. Those who know such things from the right sources soon lose all curiosity and deal with them with no sense of shame or fear of hurt. There is a large business in all such things under cover, bringing a price and arousing an interest to the degree they are illegal and hunted.

If a church starts, as we do, with the known facts about such matters, naturally it would have a different interpretation than churches on the old theological basis. These things are intrinsically right to us, and right because they are a part of life, and life is right, as they are wrong to the churches on the other foundation of fact, and intrinsically wrong, human life being what it is with what happened to it at the start.

It is always difficult for a liberal to join with other church people in their estimate of such things. One might disagree with writing or pictures as a matter of taste, tastes do differ, or about what is proper subject matter for art to be publicly shown or generally read. Liberals here would differ from others, and among themselves. But, the basic conceptions at the root of censorship are such that a liberal never could join with other churches for their reasons. It is part of the Anglo-Saxon tradition that any kind of censorship is worse than any kind of writing. This tradition we believe sound. John Milton wrote its Magna Charta and it is for us who believe it not to let the world forget it.

Some Theses of the New Humanism

OLIVER L. REISER

1. In any given "cosmic epoch" the operations of the physical world are something we must take as given, and man must function within this framework of a relatively fixed physical order of events.

2. But since "scientific laws" are provisional statements and useful only so long as they adequately describe natural processes, we human beings should not be bound too rigidly by traditional notions of what is "possible."

3. Since every event is multi-causational, we should realize that all human statements ("laws") are a product of intellectual abstraction, and accordingly all explanations and causal analyses are relative to the purposes of the investigator. Even the fundamental and time-honored "laws of thought" are a function of the stage in social evolution at which the thinker operates.

4. Our intellectual abstractions, and the linguistic equivalents which express their meanings in communications, should always be subject to semantic analysis, so that human understanding and discourse are facilitated. Our difficulties and misunderstandings frequently have a verbalistic basis.

5. Man is a real agent in determining the future course of events in nature and society. The future of our earth—perhaps the cosmos—cannot be foreseen without taking into account the role which humanity is to play in this as yet incomplete drama.

6. "Human nature" is characterized by wide plasticity, and this provides a flexible biological basis for social advance.

7. Scientific control of the world has reached a stage where our society can readily produce and distribute food, shelter, and clothing (economic security) to all. Philosophical cynicism, defeatism, and escapism arise from an inadequate understanding and ability to cope with our social problems. Our present problems and difficulties are surmountable, but the broader background of social causation is world-wide in scope, and no simple panacea will cure all our ills.

8. In order to make peace and security possible, fundamental changes in our political and economic systems are necessary. A United States of the World, implemented with police power to enforce common decisions, is the ultimate goal of social advance. *Global planning* is the next step in social intelligence.

9. It is desirable that all groups working for the improvement of the world develop means to coöperate. In order that the benefits of social coöperation may be hastened and serve universal humanity it is essential that knowledge be made available to all. Science as well as politics, religion, and economics must be socialized, universalized, and humanized.

Is Your Religion Big Enough for Your World?

KARL A. BACH

"Is your religion big enough for your world?" If you define religion as institutional or as an experience set apart from the world in which you live, then your answer to the question is "No."

But if you define religion as a power which is interfused with the whole of life, which brings to man a deeper, truer, and more enduring adjustment to the appreciation of life, then your answer is, "Yes."

If our religion cannot give succor to all peoples of the world, liberating their spirits and establishing harmony between their minds and the Universal Mind, without dictating what they shall believe in dogma, creed, and holy writ, then our religion is not big enough for our world. Then we are as guilty of setting one man against his neighbors as are rulers of the world who set nation against nation. We can never gain freedom for all peoples of the world as long as we use that freedom for our own selfish ends or gain that freedom at the expense of others.

Now, I believe that this world is in a more healthful state of mind today than it has been for centuries, chiefly because we are finding it necessary to consider the entire world in our present outlook. The more widespread this present war becomes the sooner we shall discover the common needs of mankind. We are learning that a nation, an institution, a family unit, an individual is more secure if it champions the security of all others.

We are struggling today between two conflicting points of view. One is exacting, arbitrary, uncompromising, and intolerant of mistake. It is totalitarianism or authoritarianism. It is found in religion as well as in societies and political states.

The other point of view is experimental, tolerant, often self-satisfied, even selfish—but at its best it is willing to let truth and facts lead the way. This, let us say, is found in democracy.

There are those who look on religion as above the secular and the cultural. To them it is miraculous and not of this world. It is mystical and therefore alien to the commonplace. It is unique. It should mind its own affairs and remain unspotted from the world or it will be absorbed and lost if it mingles with "earthly and transient things." It has nothing to do with politics, business, or social reform. It concerns individual morality, but only through obedience to its own rules, not the world's. It consists of worship and prayer and the observance of holy days. It is a life apart, like an altar, and thus never to be defiled by the dust of the street or the stir of men's doubts.

That is the opinion of most of the clergy and many of the laymen of the vast majority of Christian churches, whose members profess a belief in the divinity of Christ. But there are other persons, notably represented by Unitarians, who have come to regard Jesus as just a man, a human being and nothing more, who worked for social reform—there are these other individuals who identify religion with the whole of life from which it cannot be lifted any more than a tree can be lifted from its soil and survive It is experience at its highest and best, be it in art, in literature, in business, in affairs of state, or in social reform.

John Haynes Holmes has written in his volume, *Rethinking Religion,*

> Whenever there are relations between men, there are questions of justice and justice is religion. Whenever there are purposes of men there are questions of righteousness and righteousness is religion. Whenever there are nations competing for wealth and power there are questions of peace and peace is religion. Whenever there are groups and classes and races of men striving to live together there are questions of brotherhood and brotherhood is religion.

Religion must permeate all human functions, not to keep religion alive, but to keep human functions alive and in the service of society.

Slowly, but uncompromisingly, history has recorded the breakdown of class superiorities in races and religions in the face of the greater demands of a whole people. Today nations and hemispheres must break down in the face of the need for world unity.

We believe in the freedom of the individual to dream, to think, and to act as he pleases. In this country, with its unlimited resources, we have acted in the past as we pleased—calling it freedom—but not always counting the cost.

We have generally accepted democracy but few of us have had a critical appreciation of it. We have lost sight of the moral and ethical issues which hold a people together. Christian nations war against other Christians. Scientists sell their services to any employer for any purpose, disregarding the moral issues involved. Every man seems to have his price, whatever his walk of life, but in the end such shortsightedness works toward self-destruction.

If we believe in the ultimate goodness of the universe, if we have an insatiable desire to know the truth, and if we have a will to pursue it actively, we can begin in no better institution than our own liberal religious society. Our religion must be big enough for our world or neither we nor our religion will survive.

The Heavenly Word

Simple and clear for common folk
The heavenly word the Lord Christ spoke.
No thought obscure, no doctrine dim
Came from the gentle heart of him.
"Love is the law of life," said he,
"And greater law there cannot be."

Simple and clear his teaching ran:
"He loves not God who loves not man."
By only the love we freely give
Can we gain the wisdom to truly live.
To live for self is pain and strife;
To live for others, abundant life.

Simple and clear the Lord Christ's creed;
An active love is all we need.
In love the wisdom of God is ours.
Love quickens in us immortal powers.
Love is the God that makes us one
And by our love His will is done.

Simple and clear: Love never fails.
Against all evil love prevails.
From every fear love brings release.
Man's love of man brings joy and peace.
Simple and clear Christ's urgent call:
Nothing for self, but all for all!

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Religion in Wartime*

RAYMOND B. BRAGG

These lines are written within a few moments of the conclusion of the President's speech. Our nation is at war. Already the toll of that war is being counted. It seems fitting that a minister of religion bespeak his mind and heart on the vast responsibility that awaits the men and women of America in the days, the months ahead. For no one of us can escape such responsibility and no one of us would.

This war was not of our own choosing. It came to us out of quiet, if troubled, night. The leaders of this republic and the countless citizenry sought its avoidance in every way consistent with the nation's honor and integrity. To say this is not in the spirit of self-righteousness or in ignorance of our past mistakes. Of mistakes there were many. But the correction of those mistakes, as they were foreseen by those who are now our national enemies, was to heap injustice and brutality upon the blunders of the past. Appeasement of the present government of Japan would have been treason to the people of China, of the Philippines, and treason against our own traditions. There was no alternative to the action of our Congress on this day, December 8, 1941.

I ask myself, "What can a church such as ours do?" What can it do, I mean, in the service of our own people, our Unitarian people here in Minneapolis? Perhaps a better way of putting the question is this: "What must we do?"

In the first place we must maintain our own morale. I do not mean the "grass-fire" morale characteristic of many other days of stress and storm. Rather the morale that makes a man or woman equal to whatever the future may bring. You may be sure with me that war will, even a war where the battlefield is remote, bring with it unimagined tests of character and personality. There will be the inevitable uncertainties about those we love. There will be the inevitable griefs and sorrows. Death will visit some of our homes, will deprive us of the young and the promising. No service of ours will erase grief or sorrow. But in a company of earnest spirits we can share our strength as well as our sorrow. We can set our purposes high enough so that sacrifice is made worthy and glorious. The morale we would cultivate has depth as well as breadth and height.

In a group such as ours we can maintain and nurture those intimate values of life without which no struggle can be won. We can in the midst of large issues cultivate the powers of fellowship on the level of basic humanity. The education of our children in the ways of the Great Tradition must not be allowed to lapse or languish. What gain if we struggle to the ends that freedom might live if we find at the end that the oncoming generation has not learned the ways of freedom? While many will be called to the service of the country in far places, while many will serve nearer home, let us maintain here a core of meaning, a center of faith and constructive action which can dignify all our efforts.

Insofar as it is consistent with immediate tasks, a group like ours must not neglect the long-time concerns of human life and destiny. This war may last for a long time but its end will come. In the midst of it we must not fail to see the larger claims of a world restored to peace. There is a source of confidence in the long view. Men have made their significant gains over the centuries and ages. Temporary adversity is no sign of permanent loss. Freedom itself is the achievement of age-long development and appearances of any given time have been discouraging. We ought in our common life to cultivate a perspective by which the gains of man can be measured.

There is another attitude to be watched for and guarded in our group. It has to do with a sustained purpose of life. After the last war, enthusiasm flagged; from the activities of war we turned to the mistaken passivity of peace. The characterization has been made that we won the war and lost the peace. The war upon which now we enter must be followed by a winning peace. Today men of good will must steel themselves for a long term of service. Responsibility will not end when the sound of battle is stilled and the peace is initiated. When that day comes new responsibility will be added, added at a time when most of us will be tired unto death. But we dare not flag in our effort. If discouragement overtakes us while life endures, the future of mankind will be crippled irretrievably. This generation must develop a philosophy and psychology of crisis. It is a generation that must make up its mind to sustained uncertainty and unsettlement. Yet paradoxically the individual need not be uncertain or unsettled within himself. With others every last one of us must be joined to "see it through." Any easy discouragement is a crime against the larger interests of our kind.

These are the hasty conclusions brought forth by the cataclysmic events of the last twenty-four hours. In months to come we will consider together the variety of problems forced upon us by this unprecedented crisis in our nation's life. There is deeper than anything else in my mind the conviction that my religion and patriotism are not at variance. A terrible issue has been drawn between "we" and "they." Either our way of life is to be made secure in the world or it is to be overwhelmed. If to be made secure, there is demand for common enterprise beyond anything we have yet known. Our heads, our hearts, our hands must be put to the common task.

*A statement by the Reverend Raymond B. Bragg to the First Unitarian Society of Minneapolis, at the outset of war.

Faith in the Future

May Christmas bring you Faith and Hope and Cheer!
The solstice passes, and the sun returns.
Happy and bright may be your coming Year,
With Peace and Love for which the Spirit yearns.

Steadfast, the Sphinx stares toward the sullen East,
Firm in the faith new dawn the sun will bring.
Let us greet then, with wassail and with feast,
The ever-lengthening days that augur Spring.

JEROME ALEXANDER.

Is the Humanist Manifesto Humanistic?

ARCHIE J. BAHM

When Humanists affirm the fifteen statements in the Humanist Manifesto, they affirm too much. That is, they affirm too much for the good of Humanism. Both for accuracy and for ease of apprehension, the official statement of the essence of Humanism needs to be abbreviated. Both for accuracy and for preventing misapprehension, it needs to be stated less dogmatically. Dogmatism in Humanism is nonetheless detrimental to it just because it is Humanism. Dogmatism about human values tends toward denial of some human values. The Manifesto seems at times to be self-defeating.

"First: Religious Humanists regard the universe as self-existing and not created." While rejecting as a dogma the creation of the world, must Humanists accept the alternative dogma of the universe as self-existing? Rather is it not enough to postulate the apparent probability of self-existence?

"Second: Humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process." Rather, at present, the weight of evidence seems to favor emergentism and continuity. But if the weight shifts, Humanism does not thereby cease.

"Third: Holding an organic view of life, Humanists find that the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected." Why "must be"? The mind-body problem has not yet been solved satisfactorily. The nature of mind is still one of our greatest mysteries. If scientists should finally decide in favor of dualism, would such a decision destroy Humanism? Too, perhaps there are ignorant Humanists who in their process of attaining wisdom fall just short of giving up dualism; does this prevent them from being Humanists?

"Fourth: Humanism recognizes that man's religious culture and civilization, as clearly depicted by anthropology and history, are the product of a gradual development due to his interaction with his natural environment and with his social heritage. The individual born into a particular culture is largely molded by that culture." How "clearly" history and anthropology "depict" man's religious evolution is partly a matter of credulousness. Despite patient and astute observations and research there still is a great deal of guesswork involved in granting most of our sociological conclusions. Philosophy of history is still in its infancy. We may declare our faith in physical, biological, and social determination of human nature without claiming the clarity so often claimed by visionaries.

"Fifth: Humanism asserts that the nature of the universe depicted by modern science makes unacceptable any supernatural or cosmic guarantees of human values." Granted that the guarantees in which our fathers trusted no longer appeal so strongly, there seems to be no point in rejecting as unacceptable such guarantees as might have been or might become apparent. Gaining of still greater wisdom eventually may reveal more appealing evidence of cosmic guarantees. And, in the meantime it seems pointless to exclude any ray of hope from those whom it may help. Humanism involves a willingness to live *with or without* cosmic guarantees, and this does not mean necessarily without hope of such guarantees.

In the background of "musts" the next essential sounds like a begrudged concession: "Obviously Humanism does not deny the possibility of realities as yet undiscovered, but it does insist [i.e., have faith] that the [best] way [for intellectuals] to determine the existence and value of any and all realities is by means of intelligent inquiry [but how about children?] and by the assessment of their relation to human needs. Religion must [i.e., should] formulate its hopes and plans in the light of the scientific spirit and method."

"Sixth: We are convinced that the time has passed for theism, deism, modernism, and the several varieties of 'new thought.'" But will the time for theism, etc., ever be passed? Humanistic optimism is desirable, but this is undue optimism. They will continue, in part because of their value as traditions and partly because they actually serve human needs. So long as they serve the needs of particular human beings better than Humanism does, they will continue and they deserve to continue. Humanism will win its way the hard way, i.e. by actually serving human needs better than other religions, not merely by telling other religions that their day has passed, or it will not win a way at all.

"Seventh: Religion consists of those actions, purposes, and experiences which are humanly significant. Nothing human is alien to the religious. It includes labor, art, science, philosophy, love, friendship, recreation—all that is in its degree expressive of intelligently satisfying human living. The distinction between the sacred and the secular can no longer be maintained." Too bad to spoil such positive statements by the last negative one. Might not the distinction be found useful in some degree or in some circumstances? Even though the distinction is no longer fundamental, must Humanists insist that it can have no human value or serve no human end?

"Eighth: Religious Humanism considers the [most] complete realization of human personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfillment here and now [or any other possible place or time]." We are sure of our possibilities here and now, not sure of other possibilities. But as Humanists, would it not be stupid of us to exclude those types of achievement of human values which have not yet been proved impossible? Refusal to exclude other possibilities does not prevent centering efforts for human achievement here and now. "This is the explanation of the Humanist's social passion."

"Ninth: In place of [or rather in addition to] the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer the Humanist finds his religious emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life and in a coöperative effort to promote social well-being."

"Tenth: It follows that there will be no uniquely religious emotions and attitudes of the kind hitherto associated with belief in the supernatural." But there remains some evidence that some people do have uniquely religious emotions and further testify that these have yielded the "happiest moments of my life." Does Humanism seek to destroy these values? Furthermore, may not Humanists experience moments of supreme insight or feeling of cosmic unity, differing perhaps only in degree, yet experienced as a uniquely supreme degree which might usefully be described as religious?

"Eleventh: Man will [should] learn to face the

crises of life in terms of his knowledge of their naturalness and probability. Reasonable and manly [?] attitudes will [should] be fostered by education and supported by custom. We assume that Humanism will [should] take the path of social and mental hygiene and discourage sentimental and unreal hopes and wishful thinking." But why not encourage sentimental hopes, if these better serve human ends? Belief that intellectualistic Humanism can eventually succeed in widespread human service presupposes considerable wishful thinking and sentimentality. Only the future can prove whether Humanistic hopes are "unreal."

"Twelfth: Believing that religion must work increasingly for joy in living, religious Humanists aim to foster the creative in man and to encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life."

"Thirteenth: Religious Humanism maintains that all associations and institutions [should] exist for the fulfillment of human life. The intelligent evaluation, transformation, control, and direction of such associations and institutions with a view to the enhancement of human life is the purpose and program of Humanism. Certainly religious institutions, their ritualistic forms, ecclesiastical methods and communal activities must [should] be reconstituted as rapidly as experience allows, in order to function [more] effectively in the modern world."

"Fourteenth: The Humanists are firmly convinced [or perhaps some are moderately convinced and some still in doubt] that existing acquisitive and profit-motivated society has shown itself to be inadequate and that a radical [appropriate] change in methods, controls and motives must [should] be instituted. A socialized and coöperative economic order must [should] be established to the end that the equitable distribution of the means of life be possible. The goal of Humanism is a free and universal society in which people voluntarily and intelligently coöperate for the common good. Humanists demand [seek] a shared life in a shared world." Why *must* a more coöperative economic order be established? Even though we fail, in practice, Humanism need not perish so long as we keep the faith that we can some day succeed. Humanism is based on wishful thinking, upon a hope and faith that voluntary sharing will increase.

"Fifteenth and last: We assert that Humanism will: (a) affirm life rather than deny it; (b) seek to elicit the possibilities of life, not flee from it; and (c) endeavor to establish the conditions of a satisfactory life for all, not merely for the few. By this positive *morale* and intention Humanism will [should] be guided, and from this perspective and alignment the techniques and efforts of Humanism will [should] flow."

"So stand the theses of religious Humanism. Though we consider the religious forms and ideas of our fathers no longer adequate, the quest for the good life is still the central task for mankind. [We hope that] man is at last becoming aware that [probably] he alone is responsible for the realization of the world of his dreams, that [probably] he has within himself the [enough] power for its achievement. He must [should] set intelligence and will to the task."

Some day soon Humanists will reconsider their official formulation; and, profiting by about a decade of criticism, be able to restate it more carefully, precisely, succinctly, broadly, profoundly, and tolerantly; perhaps also faced with the fate of so many mere intellectualisms, more simply, soundly, and vitally.

Born in Bethlehem

George was born in Bethlehem on Christmas day, yet he is not a Christian. He came to America alone, when a very young man, many years ago and had no sooner arrived than he was sent over to fight the Kaiser in Germany. He is an American citizen, has a job, is a good worker, saves his money, observes the law, is friendly, and has the confidence of all, and regularly sends back money to his dear old mother in Syria. He has urged her to come to America but she does not want to leave her home.

Several years ago, George went back on a visit and while there got married. He could not bring his wife back with him at the time for lack of money and because of red tape, but came home alone and saved the money and got details arranged and then the war stopped ships from coming, but he still sends money back to his mother and wife by telegraph. George was born in Bethlehem on Christmas day, but he is not a Christian.

O. A. HAMMAND.

THE PUBLIC PAPERS AND ADDRESSES

OF

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Compiled and collated by SAMUEL I. ROSEMAN
Published by The Macmillan Co., New York City

Price $30.00 per set

These four massive volumes, covering the years 1937-40, constitute essential historical material for the understanding of our time. Each volume contains a special Introduction and explanatory notes by the President. The Topical Table in the 1937 volume enables the reader to follow a given subject throughout the four volumes; and the indexing is excellent.

—Curtis W. Reese

Is Pacifism Fallacious?

VICTOR S. YARROS

There are a good many pacifists in the Unitarian fraternity. The present world crisis calls for a candid and philosophical re-examination of the essentials of the pacifist doctrine. Tension and misunderstanding appear to be inevitable in any sect or group which, at this grave juncture, is divided spiritually against itself.

The strong man is not afraid to stand alone, to ignore or even defy the masses. Moral courage is an admirable, a noble quality, but it needs an intellectual sanction. Blind obstinacy is not the kind of courage that exalts men.

What is pacifism based on, and by what argument has it been justified and defended? Is it true that war is the worst of all known calamities? Is it true that the use of force is wicked and futile under *any* circumstances? Is it true that war imperils or actually destroys all the fruits of social, economic, and political progress, and that it is better to submit to any aggression than to resist it physically?

There is no evidence in history or psychology to warrant a positive answer to these questions. War is a calamity, of course, and should be avoided if possible. But slavery is a greater calamity, and the triumph of barbarism, brutality, and sadistic cruelty an infinitely worse evil.

Bertrand Russell, in a recent statement, repudiated the charge of pacifism that had been preferred against him, and declared that he had never condemned war as such. He had never believed or said, he pointed out, that the revolutionary war of the American colonies was a misfortune or a mistake, or that the American Civil War was a blunder, since Lincoln might have accepted southern secession and thus preserved peace.

And what of the English revolution, the French revolution, or the resistance of Holland and Norway to Hitler's perfidious and criminal invasion and assault? Should these countries have surrendered without firing a gun?

The pacifist who takes the view that non-resistance is morally superior and materially more advantageous than force even in defense, will find no firm support for it in any revered and accepted gospel. The Bible as a whole does *not* preach non-resistance, save in a few dogmatic sentences attributed to Jesus. But Jesus was a man and prone to error. He was a seer and moralist, but he was certainly not infallible, and his conduct did not always conform to his supposed teachings. If he believed in non-resistance to evil, then he violated his convictions when he used force to drive the money changers from the temple. This striking deed cannot be explained away by sophistry. Jesus did not *preach* to the money changers; he did not confine himself to an appeal to reason or conscience on that occasion. He used a whip.

Man is a fighting animal. At a certain point, man will resist evil—aggression, insult—physically, using his fists and the weapons he happens to possess. It is silly to overlook this trait in man. Justice and kindliness in human relations will do away with war, in the course of evolution, if evolution is given a chance to continue normally. Injustice will engender revolt, revolution, and war. Will and *should!* To exhort men to turn the other cheek to willful and iniquitous bandits who seize power and recklessly abuse it, is to address not human beings as they are, have been, and will be, but imaginary, and ghostly creatures.

We will fight for righteousness, and thus eventually bring about its reign on earth. The new barbarians cannot be reached by argument. They must be defeated, disarmed, and wiped out.

Resolution on Anti-Semitism

The following resolution on Anti-Semitism was adopted by the General Conference of the American Unitarian Association, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 30, 1941:

WHEREAS it is apparent that in our land Anti-Semitism is on the increase, being fed by the currents of hysteria and suspicion so frequently arising in periods of national emergency, and

WHEREAS Anti-Semitism represents not only a direct and flagrant attack upon a religious minority, but also constitutes an ominous threat to the security and liberty of all minority groups, be it therefore

RESOLVED, That the American Unitarian Association solemnly declare on behalf of the spirit of free religion and of Americanism that Anti-Semitism constitutes a menace to true religion, to high morality, and to the free and democratic institutions of America; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the American Unitarian Association call upon its churches and all other churches in the liberal tradition to implement their sentiments and declarations against Anti-Semitism and every kindred religious and racial prejudice with such action through the various agencies of our church organizations, such as the Church Schools, and chapters and branches of the General Alliance, Laymen's League, and Young People's Religious Union, etc., as to demonstrate to America and to the world that the Church of the Free Spirit has found not only its voice but also its purpose and will to oppose Anti-Semitism and every similar movement that tends to set creed against creed, religion against religion, man against man.

The Study Table

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

For Young People

YOUNG PEOPLE IN THE LIBERAL CHURCH. *By Stephen H. Fritchman. Boston: The Beacon Press. 99 pp. 85 cents.*

This book is a manual or textbook of young people's activities in our liberal churches. It is so good that it might well have been printed on better paper and in somewhat more attractive form.

The opening portion of the volume is a statement of the philosophy of the question, expressed in terms of the needs of young people—their biological, intellectual, religious, aesthetic, social, and material needs. Then comes a study of a young people's program as seen from the standpoint of the church and of the personal character and social adjustments of the individual. This is followed by the main body of the book, which is a detailed discussion of the problem of organizing and sustaining the work of such a program. Various age-groups are considered, aspects of leadership, teaching methods, worship, recreation projects, and so forth. All admirably and completely done!

Mr. Fritchman is ingenious, intelligent, resourceful, wise. He proves his leadership in a field which he has made his own. This book should be widely distributed and used in our churches.

A Book of Poems

ON THE VOYAGE AND OTHER POEMS. *By William Ware Locke. Boston: Manthorne & Burack, Inc.* 195 *pp.* $2.00.

Mr. Locke, an honored Unitarian minister, has long been known as a poet, and here in this attractive volume is the garnered fruitage of his years. His colleagues and many friends may well be grateful that they have available at last in collected form the hitherto scattered products of his pen.

What first impresses the reader of this book, it seems to me, is Mr. Locke's versatility. He writes excellent poems in many forms. Here are some stirring ballads, interspersed with sonnets and hymns; verses of lighter as well as of more serious vein; the majestic march of epic lines, and the lilting dance of songs and lyrics. History vies with sentiment, and nature poetry with didactic. Even the dramatic form is attempted, and not without success.

But this is the technical side of Mr. Locke's work! What is far more important is its beauty of style, its innate simplicity and good taste, its lofty spirit of vision and faith, its love of man, and its unconquerable trust in God. What this poet has done is to pour forth his religion in his verse. Respecting his art, he has found the stanza even more than the sermon the natural expression of his genius. And as the reward of his days, he has produced a volume of poetry which may outlive most of the sermon collections of our time.

It would be pleasant to name some of the poems which have particularly held my attention. But this book has nearly one hundred and fifty different pieces, and selection is difficult. The book has a remarkably even flow. As Mr. Locke never rises to the empyrean of song, so he rarely descends to the low level of mere rhyme. His poetic gift, if modest, is genuine and true. And here and there is a piece which deserves place in our anthologies.

Correspondence

Lest We Forget

TO UNITY:

Before we are engulfed in unreasoning hate and vengeance, let us remember the millions of generations between us and our first ancestors who came down from the trees, stood on their hind legs, then took to the caves. In the caves they began to develop our wonderful hands. The women took to agriculture and the domestication of animals. They discovered fire, they sought more comfortable ways for their children, while the men went out to fight. Families fought families, tribes fought tribes, clans fought clans, nations fought nations. The women were forced to be the mothers of the children of the conquerors. There can be no such thing as a pure race.

We should remember why our ancestors came across the Atlantic, and from whence they came. They did not all come to seek freedom. Most of them came to escape the prisons in England which Bishop Laud was opening for the Puritans. Some came for profit, some for adventure. The Quakers came to escape the vengeance of the established church in England. The Huguenots escaped from France. The Irish came for food. The Negroes were dragged from Africa and brought in chains. The Germans, hating the military service, brought their children here. All children born here, whether brown, yellow, black, or white, are citizens. Only the Indians are native Americans. Carefully study the history of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to learn what suffering, torture, death, and exile accompanied the slow emergence of the first ten amendments to our Constitution. Our Bill of Rights, as well as our Union, came through suffering. The minorities were the persecuted ones. Whether we are of the eleventh generation or the last generation, born this side the Atlantic, we are all citizens of the United States, who are supposed to uphold our democracy and cherish our Bill of Rights. Let those of us who are old enough recall the injustice, the spite, the jealousy, and the inborn meanness that found vent in the last World War, directed as it was against minorities, especially the hyphenated Americans. Let us all resent and prevent any attempt now to draw circles about all the members of any church, any sect, or race, whether by Charles Lindbergh, or the Ku Klux Klan, or those who blacklist people who stand for ideals of peace and good will. To say that all the descendants of those ancestors who fled the ghettos of Europe believe this or that, is absurd in these days, when even families disagree. I cannot feel that Charles Lindbergh hurt the "Jewish people" as much as some seem to think. If it were true that they all wanted war, then for the first time in the centuries of persecution, they would have found themselves standing shoulder to shoulder with those in authority, no longer a despised minority. That the "Jewish people" loathe and despise Hitler even more than most of us, is not to be wondered at. All of us who love our democracy, who believe in human kindness, would gladly join them in looking down, with pleasure, on Hitler's grave. Some of us loathe and detest the spirit of Hitler more than the man Hitler. That spirit seems disconnected from his body,—we see it in the war party of Japan; we see it in the war itself. We feel Hitler must dig his own grave, digging the ground from under his own feet, reveal himself to his own people as a throwback into the days of the jungle, if his spirit is to be buried with him. If he were suddenly removed now, he would become a martyr, a hero, a saint, whose words and writings would be held sacred, a menace until some future civilization reveals him as an enemy of all that is good.

Perhaps Charles Lindbergh saw the rising tide of anti-

Semitism in this country. Perhaps he knew, as every loyal American must know, it is a part of the Hitler spirit. Whether he knew or not, his signaling out one group of people, the descendants of those who fled the ghettos of Europe, has made us all aware of the danger to our democracy of anti-Semitism. People are thinking now, who never thought before, of the danger at home of any group turning against any other group.

What will it profit us to keep our boundaries firm, to gain new markets, new regions of natural resources, if we lose the soul of our democracy? Can we not remember how the Quakers were treated back in 1646-1670? Can we not remember the more recent race riots directed against the Negroes? Cannot all of us who love our country, who prize the freedom won through suffering, realize that the preservation of our democracy and Bill of Rights must be our chief concern? Precious little good will it do to fight for the freedom of the oppressed nations of Europe, if we do not safeguard our freedom at home.

Lest we forget, if we have not already forgotten, will not UNITY publish in every issue for the duration, the Eight Points agreed to by our President and the Prime Minister of England, as the object and aims of this war? They should not, like Wilson's Fourteen Points, be forgotten or smothered by vengeance and hate, when at last the nations of the world gather at the Peace Table to end war or sow the seeds of the next war.

OLIVE COLE SMITH.

Mt. Pleasant, Iowa.

Already Answered by the March of Events

TO UNITY:

"Be sure you are right, then go ahead"—David Crockett's motto—is generally esteemed. It seems to me it may well be heeded in this time of confusion. Not since the period preceding the Civil War has there been such disunity in our country. President Roosevelt having failed to solve domestic problems—unemployment, poverty, intemperance, crime, economic strife, mounting debt threatening financial chaos—appears confident that he can solve world problems. But the majority of our people are unwilling to accept his leadership when it seems to mean total war and still cling to the words he has abandoned—"short of war."

This disunity is not necessarily deplorable. Agreement on a wise course is indeed excellent, but unity in a disastrous policy is the unity of the Gadarene swine—"the whole herd ran violently down a steep place, and perished in the waters."

The schism in general public opinion on the war and our relation to it has its counterpart in the church. Pacifist sentiment on religious grounds has greatly increased since World War I and can no longer be ignored or scornfully swept aside. For example, in 1917-18 only seven Episcopal clergymen who opposed our participation in the war were discoverable. Now, in answer to a recent questionnaire, 293 have declared themselves pacifists.

The Christian Church, the mystical body of Christ, has no clear and positive answer to give to Christian young men subject to conscription and desiring to know whether they have a right to feel that they are doing the will of God in learning the art of wholesale killing. And many thousands of others, men and women at work in manufacturing instruments of human slaughter, would like to know whether they can pray to the universal Father that he will bless the work of their hands. Is the leadership of Jesus a ghastly failure in a time ilke this? Which way does he lead?

The situation seems to me intolerable. It calls for earnest and honest discussion of the war problem. I beg leave to put one question to the Christian interventionists. How many persons, how large a fraction of a country's population, ought to die in their country's war? *"Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori,"* to be sure, but the privilege is limited. For evidently it would be absurd for *all* the people to die that their country might live, for then it would not live. Caiaphas said, referring to Jesus, that it was "expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." That appeared reasonable. One man's life seems a small price to pay to preserve a whole nation. But what if the "one man" is such a man as Jesus? As a matter of fact, did that one man's death save the nation, as Caiaphas thought it would?

Apologists for war invariably assume, first, that their side being righteous will be victorious; and, second, that the cost in human lives will not be very great. Neither assumption is safe. If war removed only, or chiefly, elderly men who have nearly completed their contribution to society, it would not be of so doubtful wisdom. But to sacrifice the flower of a nation's youth is to destroy no one knows what potential values. I do not now ask how many Germans, our brothers-in-God, we are willing to kill in order to stop Hitler, but how many of our own young countrymen we are willing to sacrifice to that end. A million, if necessary? Five million? Ten million? This seems to me a fair question.

HENRY WINN PINKHAM.

Newton Centre, Massachusetts.
December 1, 1941.

Why Not Scientific Realism?

TO UNITY:

That was a brave, noble and superb article on "Our 'Christianity'," by Mr. Jesse H. Holmes. It went far, but not, I think, far enough. Why not abandon all terms and phrases that yield no meaning to the candid mind? Why have any religion at all, considering that all known religions are vitiated by elements of gross and crass superstition, outworn myths, and infantile fables? If we reject *all* the supernatural mysteries, so-called, which are man-manufactured, and cling to rational and scientific ethics, why not use the term scientific humanism, which is free from all obscurantist associations and childish fancies?

Ethical principles are derived from human experience. There can be no stable and decent social life without cooperation, solidarity, sympathy, respect for others. Even the Nazis have to profess certain principles and loyalties. The values of civilization cannot be destroyed. What is true and sound in Judaism, Christianity, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism are integral parts of our morals and our habits of thought. Scientific humanism retains them all, and further progress will gradually distill and refine them.

Scientific humanism stands for the brotherhood of man, for internationalism, for social control wherever necessary, for plenty of voluntary effort and enterprise, for local autonomy, for democracy as well as for personal dignity and personal liberty. But the fatherhood of god is an obsolete notion. No one has the faintest conception or image of god. No one knows where or what god is. Man, in his infancy fashioned all his gods in his own image. No one has ever refuted Spencer's arguments in his *First Principles*. *Ultimate* causes are beyond the grasp of finite minds. We are and must remain ignorant of much in and about nature and life. Why not adopt the agnostic creed of Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, Haeckel, Darwin, and many other great thinkers of modern times, and drop all confusing and misleading names?

Revelation must go. Moses never heard the voice of God; he heard his own voice. Jesus was the son of a man and a woman; he was not a god or a demi-god. The talk of "revealed" religion is puerile. There is no need of religion. There is need of reason, humanism, virtue, righteousness, and our great task is to build up an educational system that will give to the young ideals, principles, and a passionate desire to banish cruelty, injustice, and wrong from human relationships. He who is not willing to work, suffer, and die for ideals is a mean and contemptible biped. Life is not merely wine, woman, and song. What makes life worth living is opportunity for service in behalf of truth, beauty, and goodness.

VICTOR S. YARROS.

LaJolla, California.

Betrayal

TO UNITY:

I wanted to get some extra copies of the October issue for Doctor Holmes' article but, with that "Repeal Neutrality" on the cover page, couldn't. It seems a real betrayal of what UNITY has stood for in the nearly twenty-five years I have taken it. The article "Enough of Defense Talk" in the November issue seemed altogether out of place in UNITY, too. I know these are trying times but I cannot help wishing very much that UNITY could retain its character of the past.

FLORENCE HOGE.

Clearwater, Florida